BRHADĀRANYAKOPANIṢAD-BHĀṢYA-VĀRTIKA

3.3

Bhujyu Brāhmaṇam

All these worldly dealings—(even) vaidika dealings cause but transmigratory existence.

संसारान्मुच्यमानानां तथा संसरतामिह ।
देहादिनाशे तुल्येऽपि तत्रैकेषां पुनर्भवः ॥१॥
देहाद्यात्यन्तिकी हानिरन्येषां यत्र कारणे ।
सति चासति चैवं स्यात्तत्प्रयोजकमीरितम् ॥२॥

It was told (in the earlier chapter) that, in the case of some of those who are being released from the transmigratory world and are also are transmigratory here (i.e. in this world), there is (noticed their) rebirth, even when the destruction of the body etc. is quite the same and, in the case of some others, the loss of the body etc. is absolute—and also which would occur (owing to the cause,) whether present or absent. [1-2]

This refers to BU 3.2.1 and BUBV 3.2.1-7.

ग्रहातिग्रहरूपस्य मृत्योः कर्मेति निश्चितम् ।
कियती कर्मणस्तस्य व्याप्तिः स्यादिति भण्यते ॥३॥

It is decided that (the cause[1] of) Mṛtyu, which is of the nature of *graha* and *atigraha*, is (Vedic activity). Therefore, now is stated (in respect of the question) 'how much could be the extent of that (Vedic) activity.' [3]

This states the purpose of this Brāhmaṇa.

[1]This refers to *prayojaka* in verse 2 above. Here, the reference is to BU 3.2.1-7.

साधारण्यविशेषाभ्यां कर्मणश्च व्यवस्थितिः ।
विशेषावस्था प्रागुक्ता सामान्यं त्वधुनोच्यते ॥४॥

There is clear demarkation (*vyavasthiti*) of Vedic activities owing to the generality[1] and the particularity (of them); the particular nature (*avasthā*) of them is explained earlier[2] and now is discussed the generality (of them). [4]

There is a reference here to the effect of *karman* in a general (*samaṣṭi*) and a particular (*vyaṣṭi*) form. Cf. BU 1.3.12: *so 'gnir abhavat* which is for the *vyaṣṭi* form of *karmaphala*.

[1]This refers to the *samaṣṭi* form of the result, viz. attainment of the form of Sūtra.

संसारे कियती व्याप्तिरभिव्यक्तस्य कर्मणः ।
सामान्यात्मविशेषाभ्यामित्येतद्भुज्युनोच्यते ॥५॥

Bhujyu states (lit. asks) here as to how much is the extent of Vedic activity in this world which has revealed itself in the general and the particular forms.[1] [5]

[1]The general form is *abhivyakta* in the sense of Sūtra. It is very minute whereas the particular ones are very clearly visible as gross objects, viz. cattle and other wealth.

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यमोहस्य कार्येयत्तेह भण्यते ।
एतस्यां सम्यगुक्तायां नानुक्तमवशिष्यते ॥६॥

Here is (now) stated the extent (of the result) to be effected (by Vedic activity), viz. delusion regarding the true nature of the inner self[1] (*pratyak*). When this is clearly (or well) explained, there is nothing to be left to be explained. [6]

This is to clarify the statement in verse 3 above.

[1]Note the difference from the 'individual self' (Jīva).

भ्रूणहत्याश्वमेधाभ्यां न परं पापपुण्ययोः ।
इत्येवं धर्मकाराणामपि वाक्यानि कोटिशः ॥७॥

There cannot be a greater sin or merit than the killing of a foetus or (the performance of) an Aśvamedha, respectively —thus there are numerous statements of those who write on Dharma.[1] [7]

SP refers here to *Manusmṛti* 12.55 and a verse *dharmarajjvā vrajed ūrdhvam pāparajjvā vrajedadhaḥ* (source not known). Also he refers to CU 5.10.7, but NKL states *brāhmahatyāśvamedhābhyāṃ na paraṃ puṇyapāpayoḥ* (source not known).

[1]That is 'law-givers' as generally translated.

पापस्य कर्मणः कार्यमन्यत्रापि मितं यतः ।
नेहातो भण्यते भूयोऽनर्थत्वाच्चाप्यनादरः ॥८॥

Since the result of an activity resulting in sin[1] is known[2] from other sources, therefore, it is not stated here again; and also because that, being undesirable, there is disregard for it. [8]

[1]NKL refers to the statement in BU 1.3 etc. These are naturally disregarded or avoided, while the Vedic activities are not so disregarded. The underlying thought is: Vedic activity, be it of any kind, is not regarded as resulting into sin; it may result into *adṛṣṭa* or attainment of Sūtra form.

[2]This is for *mitam*.

स्वतश्च तज्जिहासायाः सिद्धत्वान्नेह कीर्त्यते ।
परमोदारफलता त्वश्वमेधाख्यकर्मणः ॥९॥

An activity innvolving sin is not discussed here, because desire to abandon it occurs by itself; but (the result) of the activity called Aśvamedha (is intended), as there is profuseness of

the rich fruit of it. There can be no Vedic instruction regarding doing activity which results in sin. [9]

This is the underlying thought in the verse.

Now follows a doubt regarding the nature of Vedic activities.

निःशेषपुरुषार्थानां पुण्यं कर्म हि साधनम् ।
इत्याहुः श्रुतयः सर्वाः स्मृतयश्चाप्यनेकशः ॥१०॥

Indeed, activities which are meritorious are the means to the entire collection of the ends of human life—thus have all the Śrutis and the Smṛtis mentioned on several occasions. [10]

Here is uderstood the sentence in the Śruti regarding the desire for heaven (*svargakāmaḥ yajeta* and the desire to know the Brahman of BU 4.4.22 etc.) *dharmāt sukhaṃ ca jñānaṃ ca* (source not known), *Gītā* 3.20 and 5.2 are referred to by SP.

पुरुषार्थत्वसामान्यात्स्वर्गादिपुरुषार्थवत् ।
पुण्यसाधनताशङ्का मुक्तेरपि यतस्ततः ।
तदाशङ्कानिवृत्त्यर्थं प्रारब्धैषोत्तरा श्रुतिः ॥११॥

Since there can be a doubt that, in the case of liberation also, (Vedic) activity can be, means to merit, as in the case of the desire for obtaining the human goal of heaven (*svargakāma ...*)— for, they are all, ends of human life in common—therefore, this subsequent Śruti has begun with an intention to remove that doubt. [11]

ज्ञानोपबृंहितस्यापि क्रतुराजस्य कर्मणः ।
संसारविषयैवाप्तिर्मुक्तौ सा न मनागपि ॥१२॥

In the case of the activity in respect of the best of sacrifices, which is strengthened by knowledge, the attainment is only

in the sphere of transmigration (*saṃsāraviṣaya*), (but) in respect of liberation, that (attainment) does not appear to be even a little. [12]

This verse explains what is meant by *āśaṅkānivṛtti* in the preceding verse.

The basis of this verse is *jñānasahitakarman* which also results in transmigratory existence. Therefore, it is to be clarified as to how the activity for achieving liberation is not related to transmigratory existence.

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यसंमोहः क्रियाकारकरूपवान् ।
प्रथतेऽपास्तनिःशेषक्रियाकारकवस्तुनि ॥१३॥

In respect of the thing, which has (by its nature) kept from the entire activity and its means, there is clearly seen delusion regarding the true nature of the inner self.[1] [13]

[1]Cf. verse 6 above.

अनिर्ज्ञातात्मयाथात्म्यैर्यत्तु कैश्चिदिहोच्यते ।
फलाभिसंधिरहितं विद्येतं कर्म मुक्तये ॥१४॥

[This verse raises an objection of those who consider ritual activity accompanied by knowledge as the cause of liberation.]

Now, as regards what is said by some, who have (really) not known the true nature of Ātman, viz. activity which is accompanied by knowledge and which, without any connection with desire for (or hankering after) the result, leads to liberation. [14]

बन्धहेत्वपि मोक्षाय विरुद्धफलकृद्यथा ।
विषदध्यादिवदिति तथोदाहृतिरुच्यते ॥१५॥

To show as to how (the ritual activity), which is the cause

of bondage, can lead to liberation, viz. as the cause of an opposite result,[1] there is an example stated in the word *visadadhyādivat*.[2] [15]

The *bandhahetu* is used as an adjective of *karman*.

[1]The thought is: ordinarily any activity leads to bondage and liberation is the absence of bondage. Therefore, ritual activity is supposed to produce bondage and not freedom from bondage.

[2]This is a reference to BUB and BUBV. Cf. verses 31-32 below.

इत्युक्तपरिहारार्थं नैतत्सम्यगितीर्यते ।
अनारभ्यत्ववचनं तद्धेतुप्रतिपत्तये ॥१६॥

Therefore, to obviate its (argument), it is rightly stated: 'This is not so' and, in order to declare the reason for it, there is a statement made about (liberation) as not having any beginning. [16]

Here Sureśvara introduces the statement of BUB: *anārabhyatvān mokṣasya*.

आरभ्यत्वाभ्युपगमे मुक्तेस्तत्स्याद्यथोदितम् ।
अनारभ्या त्वियं मुक्तिस्तत्सिद्धेर्ज्ञानहेतुतः ॥१७॥

If it is accepted that liberation is a thing having a beginning, only then would that, which is said (by those already referred to in verse 14 above) hold good, but this, viz. liberation, is what is never begun and what establishes itself only on account of knowledge. [17]

It is clearly denied that there is connection of liberation with any ritual activity.

ब्रह्म वा इदमित्युक्तेः प्रागपि ज्ञानजन्मतः ।
जगद्ब्रह्मात्मसंसिद्धेर्नातो मुक्तिः क्रियोद्भवा ॥१८॥

On the basis of (the Śruti) statement *brahma vā idam* ... (BU 1.4.10), there is established the existence of the Brahman as (the true nature) of the world, even before knowledge (of the Brahman) has arisen; therefore, from this (it is clear that) liberation is not a product of Vedic activity. [18]

The purport of this verse is to indicate that there does not exist any illustration for establishing liberation as an effect of (some) Vedic activity.

यदि वस्तु स्वतो मुक्तं परतो बद्धमिष्यते ।
मोक्षाय यत्नः फलवांस्तदा स्यान्न विपर्यये ॥१९॥

[This verse proceeds from a doubt regarding the Brahman as bound by something else or as free from bondage, by its own nature.]

If the thing (viz. reality or the Brahman) is taken to be free (from bondage), by its own nature, and bound by another, only then there would be (an effort) which would effect the result (i.e. liberation); otherwise, (it would not be) so. [19]

The argument in the verse: The cause of bondage of the Brahman may be real, i.e. existing apart from it, or that is imaginary. It is really in the first case that an effort for liberation is meaningful. If the cause of bondage is not real, there is no need of any effort!

विद्याभिव्यञ्जकैवेयं स्वतः सिद्धस्य वस्तुनः ।
आरम्भकत्वं जगति तस्या नैवोपपद्यते ॥२०॥

In respect of the thing which is established by its own nature, this knowledge is only (its)[1] revealer; indeed, in respect of that, there does not appear in the world its potence (to begin, i.e. to cause) that (liberation). [20]

This verse is called for by verse 17 above, cf. *jñānahetutaḥ*.

In this world, the example of clay can be shown as the cause of a pitcher etc., but nothing can be shown as the cause operating for effecting liberation.

[1]That is, of the Brahman.

अज्ञानमात्रव्यवधौ वस्तुनि व्यापृतिर्मितेः ।
आरभ्येऽर्थेऽफलं ज्ञानं व्यञ्जकत्वात्प्रदीपवत् ॥२१॥

In respect of the thing (i.e. reality) which is covered with ignorance only, there can be knowledge (alone) operative. (But) in respect of an object to be produced, knowledge is inoperative just, like a lamp, on account of its having a potence (only) to reveal an object. [21]

Just as a lamp reveals an already existing object, but it does not produce the same, so knowledge also reveals the already existing Brahman, it does not produce it.

न चाविद्यातिरेकेण मुक्तेर्बन्धोऽन्य इष्यते ।
निवृत्तिः क्रियते यस्य विद्येतेनेह कर्मणा ॥२२॥

It is not accepted that there is any bondage, in the case of liberation[1] except ignorance, viz that which is removed by ritual activity, accompanied by knowledge. [22]

[1]That is, in the case of the Brahman, which is ever free or in the state of liberation.

अविद्यानाशमात्रश्च मोक्ष आत्मन इष्यते ।
यतस्ततोऽतिरेकेण मोक्षोऽनित्यो भवेद्ध्रुवम् ॥२३॥

Since (also) it is accepted that liberation of the Ātman is merely the destruction of ignorance (about its nature), therefore, in case there exists any apart from that, then

liberation would certainly be non-eternal. [23]

This is another reason for not accepting knowledge accompanied by ritual activity as a means to liberation.

सम्यग्ज्ञानातिरेकेण न चान्येनास्ति निह्नुतिः ।
प्रत्यङ्मोहस्य नातः स्याज्ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयः ॥२४॥

There cannot be the destruction (lit. concealment) of delusion (about the nature of) the inner self by any means other than proper knowledge about it. Therefore, there is no combination of knowledge and activity (as the means to liberation). [24]

निर्ज्ञातविषयत्वाच्च कर्मशक्तेर्जगत्यपि ।
दृष्टं हि कर्मणः कार्यमुत्पत्त्यादिचतुष्टयम् ॥२५॥

Also, because the effects of the force of the ritual activity are very clearly known in respect of its objects, viz. the result of the ritual activity (is known everywhere),[1] in this world, viz. those four, beginning with production.[2] [25]

[1]This is the meaning given by SP, thus *sarvatrāpītyaperarthaḥ*.

[2]Those are production, attainment, modification and purification (polishing). According to SP, liberation cannot be accomplished thereby.

उत्पत्त्याप्तिविकारा हि संस्कारश्च क्रियाफलम् ।
नातोऽन्यत्कर्मणः कार्यं नातो मुक्तौ तदिष्यते ॥२६॥

Indeed production, attainment, modification and also purification (polishing) are the results of activity;[1] (and) there is no other (effect to be produced) by activity, therefore, that (viz. activity) is not accepted (as a means) in respect of liberation. [26]

SP states, the purpose of *hi* is to suggest that there is not

any fifth kind of effect produced by a cause.

[1]The sigular form *kriyāphalam* is used for the sake of metre.

न चान्यतम एतेषां मोक्षो युक्त्योपपद्यते ।
उत्पत्त्यादिप्रकाराणामनित्यत्वसमन्वयात् ॥२७॥
अविद्यामात्रव्यवधिर्यतो मोक्षोऽभ्युपेयते ।
तदन्यव्यवधाने हि प्रमाणं नोपपद्यते ॥२८॥

None of these four kinds of effects can be understood with the reason in respect of liberation, since they are invariably connected with non-eternality. [27]
Since liberation is accepted as having only ignorance as the cause of its obscurity, there indeed does not stand to reason (that there is) any authoritative means of proving it to be covered by anything. [28]

The thought is: Liberation is eternal, while all the effects are non-eternal, and therefore, liberation cannot be any one kind of the effects enumerated.

The second line of this verse anticipates an argument that there can be for liberation a covering other than ignorance.

विनाशिफलवत्त्वं चेत्केवलस्यैव कर्मणः ।
विद्येतस्य तु तस्यैव फलं ध्रौव्यं भवेदिति ॥२९॥

Since[1] mere ritual activity is associated with (only) a perishable result therefore, the result of the same (*karman*) which has accompanied knowledge is eternality—this is the objection.[2] [29]

[1]*cit ... iti* is for 'since ... therefore'.
[2]This is the force of *iti*, referring to *codyavivaraṇa* (SP).

पूर्वशक्तिनिरासेन शक्त्यन्तरसमुद्भवः ॥३०॥
वस्त्वन्तरसमायोगाद्विषादेर्दृश्यते यतः ।
प्रमाणासंभवान्मैवं वोचो लौकिकवस्तुवत् ॥३१॥

(An argument can be made thus:) 'There can arise another potence (in a certain cause) by setting aside the earlier (existing) potence, [30]
since this is noticed in the case of poison (and others) on account of their mixture with other things. (The answer to the argument is:) Do not say so, since there does not possibly exist any other authoritative means for knowing (such a mixture of it with another thing) as in the case of (other) worldly things. [31]

As poison and others can render unusual effects on account of the other things accompanying them, *karman* cannot have similar mixing with other helping causes which can produce another effect.

नागमादपरं मानं मुक्तावभ्युपगम्यते ।
विषदध्यादिवत्तस्मान्नैतत्सूक्तं भवेद्वचः ॥३२॥

In relation to liberation, there is not accepted any means other than Āgama (i.e. Vedāntic tradition) which is authoritative[1] as in the case of poison, curds etc.; therefore, this statement is not properly made. [32]

The purport of the verse is to point out that any argument regarding liberation cannot be made on the basis of an illustration (SP). Cf. [Vol.1:Introduction on *dṛṣṭānta*].

[1]The first line anticipates and answers away an argument that obligatory religious performance associated with knowledge, can produce liberation. In other words, this would be the means of effecting liberation.

उक्तकार्यातिरेकेण विषदध्यादिवन्मितिः ।
कार्यान्तरसमुत्पत्तौ कर्मणोऽपि न विद्यते ॥३३॥

There is no knowledge about Vedic activity in relation to causing any one of the (four) effects beside those which have

been stated in the same way as in the cause of poison and food etc. [33]

The verse aims at pointing out that any obligatory Vedic activity, be it associated with or not associated with knowledge, cannot produce liberation.

साध्यावृत्त्यात्मकं ज्ञानं कर्मैवावस्तुतन्त्रतः ।
ज्ञानं हि वस्तुतन्त्रं स्यान्न तु तत्कारकाश्रितम् ॥३४॥
कर्मेतं कर्म तेनेदृग्विद्येतं न कथं चन ।
क्रियासमुच्चयोऽतोऽयं न तु विद्यासमुच्चयः ॥३५॥

Knowledge, which is of the nature of repetition of what is to be accomplished,[1] is only a (kind of) activity, since it depends on what is not-the-thing[2], (or, reality, *avastutantra*) and knowledge is indeed dependent on the thing[2] (or, reality) but it is not (ever) dependent on any means of activity. [34] Therefore,[3] such kind of activity (as you have mentioned) is only accompanied by (another) activity; indeed it is not connected with knowledge in any way. Therefore, this is (only) a combination of activities but not of knowledge and activity. [35]

[1]The words 'to be accomplished' refer to the mode of worship which implies a worshipper's act in relation to the object of worship, and, therefore, it is *kartṛtantra* 'dependent on an agent'. Read SP: *sādhyaṃ dhyeyaṃ vastu tatra pratyāvṛttirūpopāstir avastutantratvāt karmaivety arthaḥ*.

[2]This refers to *vastu* the Brahman.

[3]According to SP this word suggests that Upāsanā is a *mental* activity.

साध्यसाधनसंबन्ध आगमैकप्रमाणकः ।
मुक्तेश्च साधनत्वेन कर्म नैव श्रुतं श्रुतौ ॥३६॥

The relation between what is to be accomplished and what accomplishes it is understood to be having Āgama 'traditional

scriptures' as authoritative means; but nowhere in the Śruti is heard any activity as a means to achieving liberation. [36]

The first line of this verse sets aside the idea that *pratyakṣa* etc. can lead one to understand that liberation is but an activity, whether associated or not associated with knowledge—see SP and NKL in relation to the first line, to state that the effects of the relation of *sādhya* and *sādhana* (SP) belong to the other world (Cf. the words *pāralaukika iti śeṣaḥ*) and the second line emphasises the absence of any activity in relation to liberation. Here also both SP and NKL make a mention of the Vedic passage *apāpma somam amṛtā abhūma* (*Ṛgveda* 8.48.3; *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 3.2.5.4) as a Vedic passage related to activity (*karma-sthāvaka*).

अज्ञानहानं नो मुक्तिस्तस्याः कर्म न साधनम् ।
न हि कर्म तमो हन्ति तमसीवोत्थितं तमः ॥३७॥

For us, liberation consists in the abandonment of ignorance; an activity is not a means (for achieving it). Indeed an activity does not destroy darkness in the same way as a darkness arising from (another) darkness (does not destroy it).[1] [37]

[1]Here *tamas* is equated with *ajñāna*. Yet, in the first line, *ajñāna* refers to *avidyā* and it is so understood in the simile also. But there it relates to ignorance about the nature of worldly things giving rise to the notion of another worldly thing (cf. SP: *rajjvajñāne ... bhujaṅgajñānam*).

अविद्यैकोद्भवत्वं स्याद्यद्यपि ज्ञानकर्मणोः ।
मेयैकात्म्यानुरोधित्वं तथाप्यतिशयो धियः ॥३८॥

Even though both knowledge and activity are of the nature of having arisen from mere ignorance, knowledge[1] has an excellence in that it follows (or emphasises) oneness in nature with what is to be known. [38]

[1]Here, the word *dhī* is used for *jñāna*.

नात्माविद्यामतिक्रम्य कर्मैकात्म्यानुरोधि हि ।
तमोमात्राभिजनतो नातोऽविद्यां निहन्ति तत् ॥३९॥

For, activity cannot, without transgressing ignorance, follow (i.e. lead to) oneness with the Ātman (understand the singleness of the Ātman). Therefore, that does not (i.e. cannot) destroy ignorance by merely being born from ignorance. [39]

स्वतःसिद्धात्मवस्त्वेकमात्रोत्थानत्वकारणात् ।
ज्ञानं हन्ति तमोऽशेषं न तु कर्म तमोन्वयात् ॥४०॥

Because it is associated with mere rise (of the knowledge) of the single Ātman, which is established by itself, knowledge destroys ignorance completely but *karman* does not do so, owing to its association with ignorance.[1] [40]

[1]*tamonvayāt* is for *tamomātrabhijanataḥ* in the preceding verse. Also *svataḥ ... mātrotthānatva* is for ... *mātrotthānavattva*.

अज्ञानादित्रयं प्रत्यगाभासं यद्यपीष्यते ।
ज्ञानवज्ज्ञानसंभूतेनैव प्रागभ्युपेयते ॥४१॥

Even if it is accepted then the appearance (or notion) of the inner self (is rooted in) the triad beginning with *ajñāna*;[1] yet it is not accepted before the rise of knowledge (though) it is associated with what is possessed of knowledge. [41]

[1]These are *ajñāna*, *mithyājñāna* and *saṃśaya*.

कर्मातः कारणं मुक्तेर्न कथं चन युज्यते ।
साक्षादविद्याप्रध्वस्तौ पारंपर्यात्तु युज्यते ॥४२॥

Therefore, in no way can *karman* be reasonably accepted as

the cause of liberation. It is, however, accepted as reasonable only after the destruction of ignorance itself (and this) in an indirect way. [42]

This verse clarifies in the second line that the discussion, done so far, is not opposed to the Śruti sentence regarding *vividiṣā*, viz. *tam etam vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇā vividiṣanti dānena tapasānāśakena* (BU 4.4.22).

मुक्तौ च कर्मसाध्यायां किमेकैकं विमुक्तिदम् ।
किं वा संभूय सर्वाणि कर्माणि घ्नन्ति संसृतिम् ॥४३॥

And, when thus liberation is (said to be) achieved by activity, which one of them causes liberation? or whether all the activities (operating) together bring about the cessation of (lit. destroy) transmigration? [43]

सकृद्व्ययःप्रयोगाद्वा यावज्जीवप्रयोगतः ।
एकादिदक्षिणास्वेतं विकल्पस्तुल्य इष्यते ॥४४॥

(In both these alternatives), there are three alternatives thus: whether (liberation is effected) by performance (of the activity) only once, or by repeated performances, or by continuing to perform them till the end of life; and whether by offering a fee of one or many or all cows? [44]

काम्यैर्वा यदि वा नित्यैः सर्वैर्वा मुक्तिरिष्यते ।
श्रौतैर्वा यदि वा स्मार्तैर्यदि वोभयकर्मभिः ॥४५॥

Or, is liberation accepted to be resulting from (or, effected by) actions related to desire? or obligatory rituals? or from (the performance of) all of them? or is it by (only) the Śrauta rites? or only the Smārta rites? or by both of them together? [45]

तेषां च ज्ञानसंयोगे प्रधानगुणभेदतः ।

त्रिधा विकल्पो विज्ञेयो विमुक्तिफलसिद्धये ॥४६॥

And also, in combination with knowledge, there should be accepted three alternatives, as both of them (i.e. knowledge and activity) are together being equally important, or related as the principal and the subordinate. (Thus) there should be understood a threefold option in respect of the accomplishing of the result, viz. liberation. [46]

एकैकं मुक्तिकृच्चेत्स्याद्यववव्रीह्यादिहोमवत् ।
एकेनैव कृतार्थत्वान्नानुतिष्ठेत्ततोऽपरम् ॥४७॥

If each one brings about liberation, even as the offering of barley or rice grains etc., then, because the end is achieved by any single one of them, one should not perform any other (action). [47]

प्रयोगे दक्षिणायां च समानोऽयं परिक्रमः ।
अथ संभूय सर्वाणि मुक्ति कर्माणि कुर्वते ॥४८॥
ऐककर्म्यं ध्रुवं प्राप्तसर्वेषामपि कर्मणाम् ।
दर्शादिवत्फलैकत्वात्तच्चानिष्टं प्रसज्यते ॥४९॥

This manner of activity is similar in respect of the performance and also of offering fees. (As for other alternatives,) if all the actions combined together bring about liberation, [48] then, indeed, there would result only oneness of activity in respect of all of those activities and there would contingently result the undesired effect, as in the case of the rite of *darśa* etc., since they have only one result. [49]

अन्यद्धि मुक्तिफलतः काम्यानां श्रूयते फलम् ।
तेषां मुक्तिफलत्वं तु न श्रुतेर्नापि चान्यतः ॥५०॥

(Also,) in respect of ritual activities proceeding from desire, there is heard (in the Śruti) a result which is other than the result, viz. liberation. It is not heard either from the Śruti

or from elsewhere that they have liberation as their result. [50]

न च गोदोहनन्यायः काम्यकर्मसु युज्यते ।
तेषां मुक्तिफलत्वे हि न मानं विद्यते यतः ॥५१॥

Nor also does the procedure in the example of Godohana[1] stand to reason, in respect of the rites done with desire, since there is indeed not any authoritative means to inform that they result in liberation. [51]

The verse emphasises *śrutivirodha* to the alternantive in respect of *kāmyādi* rites.

SP quotes here, very possibly, the view of Bhartṛprapañca: *yathāhuḥ anyārtham api saṃnihitam anyena sambadhyata iti.*

[1]It is the rule about the result from Godohana. It cannot be reasonably understood in respect of ritual acts performed with desires.

Cp. *kāmyasūktānām mahāvrate ājyaśastratvena yathoktānām godohananyāyena puruṣārthatvaṃ eva na kratvarthatvam* (*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka Sāyaṇabhāṣya* 1.1.1.16). Also cf. *Śābara's Bhāṣya* on *Jaimini Sūtra* 4.1.2.2.

Sureśvara states in the verse that this example of Godohana is not reasonably accepted in relation to more than one *kāmyakarmans* functioning together.

सर्वं चाप्यप्रमाणं स्याद्यदुक्तं भेदलक्षणम् ।
मुक्तिं सर्वाणि कर्माणि यदि संभूय कुर्वते ॥५२॥

If it is held that all the ritual activities (performed) together would bring about liberation, all that is said (in Mīmāṃsā) by way of defining the distinctions (of activities) would be unauthoritative. [52]

This argument, which is related to the performance of all the rites together as a means to liberation, points to the

contingent unauthoritativeness in the Mīmāṃsā text that discusses the variety of different ritual activities.

साध्यसाधनबुद्धिर्नो वचनात्पारलौकिकी ।
न चाश्रौषं श्रुतेर्वाक्यात्कर्म मोक्षफलं क्वचित् ॥५३॥

For us, the knowledge regarding what is to be accomplished and what accomplishes it in relaltion to the other world comes from the statement (in the Śruti). And I have not anywhere heard from (any) sentence or from the Śruti that ritual activity has liberation as its result. [53]

न तत्र दक्षिणा यन्ति विद्ययैव तदाप्यते ।
वेदाहमिति मन्त्रश्च ज्ञानान्मार्गान्तरापनुत् ॥५४॥

The sentences *na tatra dakṣiṇā yanti*,[1] *vidyayaiva tadāpyate*[2] and also the Mantra *vedāham* ...[3] set aside any other thing than knowledge as the way (to liberation). [54]

[1]*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 10.5.4.16.
[2]Not traced.
[3]*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 3.12.7.

न कर्मणा कनीयस्ता वृद्धिर्वा नान्तरात्मनः ।
नित्योऽस्य महिमेत्येवमुदर्केऽपि प्रवक्ष्यते ॥५५॥

By (the performance of a) ritual activity there does not result inferiority and superiority in respect of the inner self;[1] its greatness is eternal—thus it would be declared later also. [55]

This verse seems to be based on BU 4.4.23.

[1]The mention of the inner self refers to state of liberation. No excellence is added to it or diminished from it by any activity. The attainment of oneness with the single Ātman, which is implied in liberation, cannot be produced.

क्षयी कर्मार्जितो लोको नित्यो ज्ञानजितस्तु यः ।
इति स्पष्टं श्रुतेर्वाक्यं कस्मान्नाद्रियते त्वया ॥५६॥

'The world that is obtained by ritual activity is perishable, whereas that which is obtained (lit. won) by knowledge is eternal,' thus there is a clear statement in the Śruti; why do you not (accept) this regardfully? [56]

समुच्चयश्चाप्यसकृत्पुरैव सुनिराकृतः ।
भूयोऽपीह प्रवक्ष्यामः प्रसङ्गान्नातिविस्तरात् ॥५७॥

As for the combination[1] of knowledge and activity, it is well refuted (by us) already and here we should discuss it again, but, now, only because it is occasioned and (we shall state the refutation) not in extent. [57]

[1]SP refers to the threefold combination already mentioned, i.e. knowledge and activity are on equal footing, they are related as the principal and the suboardinate and *vice-versa.*

संनिपत्य न च ज्ञानं कर्माज्ञानं निरस्यति ।
साध्यसाधनभावत्वादेककालानवस्थितेः ॥५८॥

Knowledge and activity, being together,[1] cannot set aside ignorance because of their relation as an end and a means and because they cannot belong to one point of time. [58]

Performance of rituals is a means of purification of *manas* and knowledge is the end to be accomplished. Therefore, they must belong to two different points of time and, as a result, there cannot be any relation between them as the principal and the subordinate.

[1]The word *sannipatya* means 'coming/falling together', the idea of it occurs again in the note on verse 66 below.

बाध्यबाधकभावाच्च पञ्चास्योरणयोरिव ।

एकदेशानवस्थानान्न समुच्चयता तयोः ॥५९॥

And, since they are in a relation of what is to be stultified and what stultifies, they cannot belong to one place, in the same way as a lion and a ram; therefore there cannot be a combination of the two. [59]

This is to set aside the idea that knowledge and activity can combine, being on equal footing. The simile of a lion and a ram vividly points to the impossibility of their being together. Here we should remember that activity is *bādhya* while knowledge *bādhaka*.

बाध्यबाधकभावेन काममस्तु समुच्चितिः ।
स्वशक्त्यनपहारेण दाह्यदाहकयोरिव ॥६०॥

(Yet one might argue:) Let there be a combination of the two standing in relation of what is to be stultified and what stultifies it. (But this cannot be) since neither of them will have given up its own nature[1] in the same way as what is burnt and what burns. [60]

Fire and grass cannot remain together because fire burns it. In the same way *bādhya* and *bādhaka* cannot coexist.

[1]It literally means 'potence'.

अयथावस्त्वविद्या स्याद्विद्यैतस्या विरोधिनी ।
समुच्चयस्तयोरेवं रविशार्वरयोरिव ॥६१॥

Ignorance is a thing[1] which is not the thing (i.e. reality) as it is and activity is opposed to it; therefore, a combination of the two, thus (proposed), will be like that of the sun and darkness. [61]

[1]It is merely an appearance of something which is later proven as not existing; for example, a serpent appearing in place of

a rope. That is, both of them cannot have their effects at one and the same time. Such is the case of knowledge and activity.

वस्त्वधीना भवेद्विद्या कर्त्रधीना क्रिया तथा ।
कर्त्रादि चात्ममोहोत्थं स्वतोऽकारकतात्मनः ॥६२॥

Knowledge is dependent on the thing (i.e. reality or the Brahman) and (*tathā*) activity is dependent on an agent (of an activity) and (the notion of) the agent etc. are but the products of ignorance. So also, in the case of the Ātman, there is no agency of an act of its own.[1] [62]

[1]It is only through ignorance that the variety such as an agent is superimposed on the Ātman.

बृहस्पतिसवे यद्वत्क्षत्रियो न प्रवर्तते ।
ब्राह्मणत्वानहंमानी विप्रो वा क्षत्रकर्मणि ॥६३॥

As Kṣatriya does not proceed to perform the Bṛhaspatisava sacrifice because he does not have the Ego (i.e. awareness) of (possessing) Brāhmaṇahood. So also, a Brāhmaṇa does not enter on an activity prescribed for Kṣatriya (because he does not have the Ego or awareness of being a Kṣatriya).[1] [63]

[1]SP points out that this clause is warranted by the word *vā* in the verse.

विदेहो वीतसंदेहो नेति नेत्येव बोधितः ।
देहाद्यनात्मदृक्तद्वत्तत्क्रियां वीक्षतेऽपि न ॥६४॥

A person, who does not have the Ego of having a gross body (*videha*) and who is devoid of any subtle body (*vītasandeha*), is enlightened (by the words in the Śruti) *neti neti*. In the same way, (in the self), which looks on a body etc. as some non-Ātman, does not ever consider (lit. see) any act to be performed by that (as its own). [64]

The words *videha* and *vītasaṃdeha* are used by Sureśvara with special meanings. Read SP: *sthūladehābhimānahīno videhaḥ saṃśayādidharmakasūkṣmadehābhimānaśūnyaś ca vītasandehaḥ*. Also, cf. NKL.

मृत्स्नेभके यथेभत्वं शिशुरध्यस्य वल्गति ।
अध्यस्यात्मनि देहादीन्मूढस्तद्वद्विचेष्टते ॥६५॥

As a child superimposes the character of a (real) elephant on elephant made of clay and chatters (about it), so also a foolish person superimposes on the Ātman (within him) a body etc. and performs activities. [65]

स्थाणुं चोरधियालाय भीतो यद्वत्पलायते ।
बुद्ध्यादिभिस्तथात्मानं भ्रान्तोऽध्यारोप्य चेष्टते ॥६६॥

As holding (considering) a pillar to be a thief, a person becomes fear-stricken and runs away, similarly, a person who has mistaken (the real nature of the Ātman) superimposes on it intellect etc. and (thus) deluded keeps on doing activities. [66]

The doubt underlining this verse is based on *yad eva vidyayā karoti* (CU 1.10) and *jñātvā karmāṇi kurvīta* (not traced).

Earlier, there is refutation of the idea of the combination of knowledge and activity that have occurred together (*sannipatya*) here it is meant that the combination proceeds from the cause, viz. ignorance and what causes it, viz. false knowledge.

स्थाणोः सतत्त्वविज्ञानं यथा नाङ्गं पलायने ।
आत्मनस्तत्त्वविज्ञानं तद्वन्नाङ्गं क्रियाविधौ ॥६७॥

As the knowledge of the true nature of a pillar is not a part (i.e. cause) of (the ignorant's) running away, similarly, in the performance of rituals, the knowledge of the true nature of the Ātman cannot be its part (i.e. cause). [67]

यद्धि यस्याविरोधेन स्वभावमनुवर्तते ।
तत्तस्य गुणभूतं स्यान्न प्रधानाद्गुणो यतः ॥६८॥

What indeed follows in nature, something without opposing it, is to be considered as the subordinate to that, for, the subordinate does not overpower[1] the principal one. [68]

Here Sureśvara states the idea of what can stand in relation as principal and suboardinate.

[1]The word in verse is *pradhānād* explained as *pradhānam atti* (*iti*).

अज्ञानमनिराकुर्वज्ज्ञानमेव न सिध्यति ।
विपन्नकारकग्रामं ज्ञानं कर्म न ढौकते ॥६९॥

Knowledge would certainly not be (lit. establish) itself, if it is not setting aside (or, stultifying) ignorance; therefore, knowledge does not promote (*ḍhaukate*) the conglomeration of various factors of activity which are set to naught (by it). [69]

हेतुस्वरूपकार्याणां प्रकाशतमसोरिव ।
मिथो विरोधतो नातः संगतिर्ज्ञानकर्मणोः ॥७०

Therefore, there cannot be the occurrence together of knowledge and activity, which have their means of knowing them, the nature of them, and the effects of them, mutually opposed, as in the case of light and darkness. [70]

Read SP and note in NKL edition: *jñānasyamānam hetuḥ svarūpaṃ vastuprakāśakatvaṃ kāryam avidyādhivastiḥ. karmaṇo hetur avidyārāgādi svarūpam aprakāśakatvaṃ kāryam utpattyādi.*

सकृत्प्रवृत्त्या मृद्नाति क्रियाकारकरूपभृत् ।
अज्ञानमागमज्ञानं सांगत्यं नास्त्यतोऽनयोः ॥७१॥

The knowledge (about the nature of the Ātman) from scriptures by its occurrence only once completely destroys ignorance, assuming the forms of activity and what effects them; therefore, there is no going together of these two. [71]

सर्वथा नैव घटते ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयः ।
विद्ययैव तमोहानादकार्ये कर्म किंफलम् ॥७२॥

Everywhere (or, At any time), thus, a combination of knowledge and activity can never occur. Because of knowledge alone there is effected destruction (lit. abandoning) of ignorance (lit. darkness). Therefore, in respect of what is not to be effected (*akārya*), what is the purpose (lit. result) of activity? [72]

न मानं किंचिदप्यस्ति ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चितेः ।
प्रत्यक्कैवल्यसंसिद्धौ ज्ञानादेव तमोहतेः ॥७३॥

There is not any authoritative means of knowing the combination of knowledge and activity, because it is through knowledge alone that there is effected destruction of ignorance, towards effecting (lit. establishing) the singleness of the inner self. [73]

उत्पत्त्याद्यतिरेकेण संसारविनिवृत्तये ।
कर्मणोऽपि तथा मानं न किंचिदुपपद्यते ॥७४॥

So also, there is not reasonably postulated any authoritative means to conveying that activity also can lead to cessation of transmigration, besides (the four, viz.) production etc. [74]

In verses 75-78, Sureśvara states the prima facie view that the performance of obligatory ritual leads to liberation.

अस्ति मानं यतो नित्यं कर्म सर्वत्र चोद्यते ।
न चोत्पत्त्यादिमत्किंचित्तत्र साक्षात्फलं श्रुतम् ॥७५॥

(A view is held:) Indeed there is an authoritative means (conveying that the perfomance of obligatory ritual leads to liberation), since the obligatory ritual is enjoined everywhere (in the Śruti) and yet, in those places, there is not any direct result heard. [75]

All the Śrutis agree in holding *yāvaj jīvam agnihotraṃ juhūyāt* .... Now, normally the Śruti does not lay down any act, unless it produces some result; therefore, in the absence of the mention of any one of production etc., we should take its result to be liberation. The *prima facie* view appears to have the words *karmaṇā pitṛlokaḥ* (BU 1.5.16) as the guiding force. This is a direct mention of the result heard.

विश्वजिद्वन्न सामर्थ्यं तत्र संभाव्यतेऽण्वपि ।
उत्पत्त्यादिफलोद्भूतौ मुक्तिरस्तु ततः फलम् ॥७६॥

So also, not even a little of effectiveness (lit. potence) is to be thought of in that (obligatory ritual), as in the case of the sacrifice called *viśvajit* (where there is not a mention about) the rise of the result, viz. production etc.; therefore, let the result be liberation. [76]

There is a text *viśvajitā yajeta* which prescribes *viśvajit* sacrifice, yet there is not any mention made of the result effected by it. Therefore in this case they adopt Mīmāṃsā rule *sa svargaḥ syāt sarvān praty aviśiṣṭatvāt* 'Let that be heaven, because that is not specially mentioned apart from activity'. The *prima facie* view states that, in a similar way as *viśvajit*, the obligatory ritual also should be taken to have a result, viz. they should produce liberation.

SP refers to a passage in the Śruti *yad yad dhi kurute jantus tat tat kāmasya ceṣṭitam* (source not known).

पुरुषार्थेऽसति फले विधानं नोपपद्यते ।

नित्यानां कर्मणां तस्मिन्सत्येव घटते यतः ॥७७॥

There cannot be reasonably any injunction (regarding a rite), unless there is some purpose (or end) of human life (to be achieved by it), since only that being there, the obligatory ritual can be acceptable. [77]

दुःखात्मकेषु नित्येषु समीक्षापूर्वकारिणः ।
पुरुषा न प्रवर्तेरन्न चेत्तेभ्यः फलं भवेत् ॥७८॥

(If, on the contrary,) the obligatory rituals are of the nature of (i.e. intending) merely to effect misery, then, men, who enter on activity after having thought over it, would not enter on them, if they did not produce any (useful/desired) result. [78]

In verses 79-133, Sureśvara states for the refutation of the prima facie view.

नैवं वाक्यात्फलं यस्मान्न किंचिदपि लभ्यते ।
तत्सामर्थ्यश्रवाभावात्फले नातो मितिश्च नः ॥७९॥

It is not so, since, for us, there does not follow that result, viz. liberation, from a sentence 'from which no knowledge regarding the fruit of activity is obtained.' That is (only) because there is not heard (anywhere) its effectiveness (or, potence) (in respect of liberation). [79]

This argument is related to a certain authoritative means of knowing called Arthāpatti. Therefore, as in the case of *viśvajit*, where heaven is accepted as its result, the Siddhāntin would accept liberation as the result of the obligatory ritual, inasmuch as there is want of any authoritative means to that effect.

प्रमाणबलतः प्राप्तमपि भूरि न वार्यते ।
अणुमात्रं न तद्ग्राह्यं वस्तु यन्निष्प्रमाणकम् ॥८०॥

If, on the strength of some authoritative means, a lot of activities are known (lit. obtained), that would not be set aside by us. (But) not even a little of the thing known (from any injunction is set aside by us) when it is without any authority (for it). [80]

पुमाशयवशाच्चेयं फलक्लृप्तिस्त्वयोच्यते ।
अन्यानपेक्षं सन्मानं प्रमेयार्थसमर्पकम् ॥८१॥

Also, this method[1] is upheld (lit. stated) by you, with the intention of a man in view. As against this, (we accept) that, as an authoritative means which informs us about some thing to be known,[2] (when it is) not dependent on any other (object). [81]

In the first line, the Siddhāntin points out the purposefulness of Arthāpatti for one who expects some worldly ends of human life. In the second line, the Siddhāntin states what can really be the authoritative statement of the Śruti, viz. it should be in relation to the knowledge of the Brahman.

[1]That is, acceptance of Arthāpatti.

[2]That is, the Brahman.

प्रत्यवायाद्यभावश्च फलं नित्यस्य कर्मणः ।
क्लृप्तं सत्कल्प्यते कस्माद्विमुक्तिर्नित्यकर्मणः ॥८२॥

And, the result of the (performance) of the obligatory ritual is the absence of any untoward thing etc.[1]; then, why imagine (i.e. posit) liberation as the result of the obligatory ritual when there is existing one, viz. that is (already) stated? [82]

[1]*ādi* stands for *pāpanivṛtti*.

तावतैव कृतार्थत्वाद्विधेर्नित्यस्य कर्मणः ।
विमुक्तिफलसंबन्धे न मानं विद्यते ततः ॥८३॥

If only thereby[1] the injunction regarding the obligatory ritual became powerful, then it does not remain as an authoritative means (to show) its relation to the result, viz. liberation. [83]

Read SP: *klptakalpyamānayoḥ klptam balavat iti nyāyavirodham arthāpatteḥ*, which is the basis for this verse.

[1]This refers to *pratyavāyādyabhāvaḥ* in the preceding verse.

अन्यथानुपपत्त्या चेद्विश्वजिद्वत्प्रकल्प्यते ।
फलं कथं नु न भवेद्विश्वजिन्न्याय ईर्यताम् ॥८४॥

If, owing to the absence of any other reasonable basis (for an injunction regarding the obligatory ritual), the result is considered as one similar to (that of an injunction regarding) the *viśvajit* sacrifice, then, let it be told why (you do not accept) the example of *viśvajit*. [84]

This is related to verse 76 above.

काम्याग्निहोत्रवन्नित्यं काम्यं चापि प्रसज्यते ।
फलेनास्याभिसंबन्धान्निष्कामं नित्यमुच्यते ॥८५॥

And, there would be a contingency that an obligatory ritual is based on some desire just like Agnihotra, which is based on some desire, since it (viz. an obligatory ritual) has connection with a result; but it is free from any desire. [85]

मतं चेन्न फलत्वेन मोक्षो नित्योऽभ्युपेयते ।
प्रतिज्ञातार्थहानाप्तेर्नैवमप्युपपद्यते ॥८६॥

If it is held that liberation is not an invariable result (of an obligatory ritual), then there would follow the abandoning of what is enunciated;[1] and (your argument) also would not be reasonable. [86]

The verse is based on the argument that liberation is the result of an obligatory ritual which is not connected with the results of a Vedic sacrifice invariably.

[1]This refers to the earlier statement that the obligatory ritual results in liberation.

आरभ्यमाणता मुक्तेः प्रत्यज्ञायि त्वयैव सा ।
विरुध्यतेऽफलोक्त्यैवमारभ्यं स्याद्यतः फलम् ॥८७॥

You yourself have already enunciated that liberation is what can be begun (to be produced) and that is opposed by the statement that there is no result, for, (it is already taken for granted) that a result is begun by the performance. [87]

The verse explains, as earlier enunciated, how there is subsequent abandoning of the view enunciated.

मुक्तेश्च कर्मकार्यत्वे विशेषो भवतोच्यताम् ।
स्वर्गादिभ्यो विनाशादौ मोक्षे तेऽनिर्वृतिर्यतः ॥८८॥

Further, in holding liberation as the effect of some activity, what difference of it from heaven etc. can be pointed out by you?—this is because there can be (the end, lit. destruction, of the same) and, thus, you do not have final peace in liberation. [88]

The argument is: The *prima facie* view holds liberation as the result of some activity (here, an obligatory ritual), therefore, it means that it has an end. Therefore, liberation is not thus perennial peace.

अथोपचारतो मोक्षः कार्यं स्यान्नित्यकर्मणः ।
ज्ञानकार्यवदित्येवं मतं चेन्नैवमिष्यते ॥८९॥
अज्ञानध्वंसकारित्वान्मोक्षो ज्ञानस्य भण्यते ।
उपचारात्कार्यमिति तदसत्त्वान्न कर्मणः ॥९०॥

If it is held: 'Liberation is metaphorically (*upacāratah*) held as the effect of obligatory ritual, like the effect of knowledge,' then, (the answer to this argument is:) This is not accepted (lit. desired);
[89]
liberation is described as the effect of knowledge, because it (viz. knowledge) has the potence of effecting the destruction of ignorance and that, the effect can metaphorically occur, is impossible to happen. Therefore, (liberation is not the result) of (obligatory) ritual.
[90]

व्यवधानापनुज्ज्ञानं न कर्माज्ञानहानिकृत् ।
यतोऽतो नोपचारेण कर्मणो मुक्तिकार्यता ॥९१॥

Since knowledge is (i.e. acts as) the remover of what obscures (the real nature of the Ātman) and not (any) ritual activity does bring about the abandonment of ignorance; therefore, it is not reasonable to say that ritual activity has liberation as its result.
[91]

This verse explains *tad asatvān na karmanah* (in the preceding verse).

न चाज्ञानातिरेकेण व्यवधानान्तरं मतम् ।
निवर्त्यत्वेन मोक्षस्य कर्मणा यन्निवर्त्यते ॥९२॥

And it is not accepted that beside ignorance there can be (or, is) any cause of obscurity (of the real nature of Ātman), which is removed by an activity as what is to be removed in respect of liberation.
[92]

The word *vyavadhānāntara* is understood by the commentator (of SP) to refer to some cause other than ignorance and capable of obscuring the nature of the Ātman.

विरोध्यन्तरविध्वंसो दृष्टो लोके विरोधिना ।

तमःप्रकाशवत्कर्म नाज्ञानेन विरुध्यते ॥९३॥

It is seen in the world that there is destruction of opponent by another who is opposing him, in the same way as light (opposes) darkness. And a ritual act is not opposed by any ignorance. [93]

Here it is argued that the performance of ritual activity itself proceeds from ignorance alone and, therefore, it cannot remove ignorance which obscures the true nature of Ātman. This refers to the meaning of *vyavadhānāntara* in the preceding verse.

मतमज्ञानमेवैतत्कर्म नाशयतीति चेत् ।
नाविरोधात्तमो हन्ति कर्म किंचित्कदा चन ॥९४॥

If (again) it is held that this (performance of) the activity destroys only ignorance, there is still no opposition between the two and thus it cannot be that the activity can destroy ignorance. [94]

अज्ञानमनभिव्यक्तिर्बोधोऽभिव्यक्तिरात्मनः ।
बाध्यबाधकभावोऽयं विरोधाद्घटते तयोः ॥९५॥

Ignorance consists in not allowing (the true nature of the Ātman) to be revealed, whereas knowledge consists in the revealing of the nature of the Ātman, therefore, the relation of what is to be stultified and what stultifies it can occur between the two, owing to the basic opposition of them. [95]

This verse completes the argument which is stated in verse 93 above.

विरुद्धधर्मकत्वं तु मिथो नाज्ञानकर्मणोः ।
बाध्यबाधकभावोऽयं न तयोर्युज्यते ततः ॥९६॥

But, in the case of ignorance and ritual activity being mutually

contradictory and the consequent relation of the stultified and stultifier cannot stand to (any) reason. [96]

कर्मणोऽदृष्टसामर्थ्यं यद्यज्ञानापनुन्मतम् ।
ज्ञानेनाज्ञानविध्वस्तेः प्रात्यक्ष्यात्तदसद्वचः ॥९७॥

If it is held that the potence of the *adṛṣṭa* resulting from activity is the remover of ignorance, then, a statement of that could not hold good, since the destruction of ignorance by knowledge is a matter of direct perception. [97]

Read SP: *dṛṣṭe sati adṛṣṭakalpanānyāyyā.*

तुषतण्डुलनिर्मोके प्रत्यक्षे ह्यवघातजे ॥९८॥
सामर्थ्यात्तद्विनिष्पत्तिर्नाग्निहोत्रादिकर्मणः ।
कल्प्यते तद्वदेवेह प्रत्यक्षेणावबोधतः ॥९९॥
प्रत्यगज्ञानविध्वंसे सामर्थ्यान्नित्यकर्मणः ।
न युक्तोऽज्ञानविध्वंसो बलात्कल्पयितुं त्वया ॥१००॥

When the removal of husk from rice (grains) as resulting from their being pounded is a matter directly perceived, [98]
effecting this[1] result by (the performance) of Agnihotra etc., owing to the potence, being imagined (is unreasonable); in the same way, (there is the destruction of ignorance) by knowledge directly perceived. [99]
Therefore, it is not reasonable that you hold per force[2] that there can be destruction of ignorance about (the nature of) the inner self owing to the potence of obligatory ritual. [100]

[1]That is, *tuṣataṇḍūlanirmoka.*
[2]That is, without any authoritative means.

कर्मभिश्चाविरुद्धं यद्देवताद्रव्यतत्त्वगम् ।
समुच्चीयेत तज्ज्ञानं न तु कर्मविरोधि यत् ॥१०१॥

(Only) that knowledge, which pertains to the nature of the

deity and the material, is not opposed to ritual activity and is combined with them; but not (that knowledge) which is opposed to ritual activity. [101]

This verse is based on the *prima facie* view which seeks to find support in the argument *yad eva* ... in CU 1.1.10.

कल्प्ये चादृष्टसामर्थ्ये नित्यानां कर्मणां त्वया ।
विरुद्धं कर्मभिः किं वा यदुत्पत्त्यादिवर्जितम् ॥१०२॥

Even if you were to imagine the potence of *adṛṣṭa* in the case of the obligatory ritual, (you have to point out) if it is opposed to the actions or it is devoid of (any relation to) production etc. [102]

This argument proceeds from granting the potence of *adṛṣṭa* and its answer indicates that, in the case of liberation, its relation to production etc. cannot be entertained.

न जन्यजनकं वस्तु न द्रव्यगुणकर्मभिः ।
जन्यते यत्फलं तादृक्कल्प्यतां नित्यकर्मणः ॥१०३॥

Let that kind of result of the obligatory ritual be imagined which does not bring about a thing which creates what is to be created and also which is not produced by materials, various qualities and activities. [103]

We follow the reading in the NKL edition as opposed to *janyaṃ janakam* in the AnSS edition.

किं वोत्पत्त्यादिमत्किंचित्सामर्थ्यं यत्र कर्मणः
तादृक्फलं प्रकल्प्यं स्याद्यथा न्याय्यं तथास्त्विह ॥१०४॥

That kind of result should be imagined towards which a ritual activity has some potence, associated with production etc.; let that be here, in this respect, in accordance with what is suitable

(*nyāyya*). [104]

अवश्यं चेत्प्रकल्प्यं स्यात्पुंस्प्रवृत्तिप्रयोजकम् ।
तदुत्पत्त्यादिमत्स्वेव युक्तं कल्पयितुं फलम् ॥१०५॥

If that (kind of result) is necessary to be imagined as promoting a human being's activity, it is proper to imagine such one as is suitably connected with things that are related to production etc. [105]

अर्थापत्तेश्च तत्रैव क्षीणत्वान्मोक्षकल्पने ।
न सामर्थ्यं यतस्तस्मान्न युक्ता मुक्तिकल्पना ॥१०६॥

Since (the means of knowing, viz.) Arthāpatti has exhausted itself in conveying only that,[1] it does not have potence to convey the notion of liberation; therefore, it is not reasonable to propose liberation (as the result of obligatory ritual). [106]

[1]Namely, referring to production etc.

नित्यस्य कर्मणः कार्यं पारिशेष्यसमाश्रयात् ।
युक्ता कल्पयितुं मुक्तिरन्यस्यासंभवो यतः ॥१०७॥

(One can argue thus:) 'Because it is by resorting to the principle of residuum that we have to imagine the effect of obligatory ritual; it is (only) reasonable to think of liberation, since there is no possibility of another. [107]

मोक्षात्फलान्तरैर्योगः काम्यानां स्याच्छ्रुतत्वतः ।
नित्यकर्माभिसंबन्धो मुक्तेः स्यात्पारिशेष्यतः ॥१०८॥

'In the case of the rituals proceeding from desire, there is connection of them with results other than liberation; for, they are (so) heard; but the relation of obligatory ritual should be (only) to liberation, owing to the principle of residuum. [108]

मैवं कर्मफलव्यक्तेरानन्त्यादुपपद्यते ।
पारिशेष्यनयद्वारा मुक्तेः कर्मफलात्मता ॥१०९॥

(The answer is:) Do not say so, since there stands to reason the idea of the appearance of the result of ritual activity in innumerable ways, (but) liberation as the result of obligatory ritual (as posited by you) is only through the principle of residuum. [109]

The idea of this verse is to be explained in the following verse.

पुंस्कामविषयाणां तु नेयत्तेहोपपद्यते ।
काम्यकर्मफलानां हि तथा तत्साधनस्य च ॥११०॥

And (*tu*) there is here[1] no reasonable counting (*iyattā*) pertaining to men's desires; so also, of the result of the rituals proceeding from desires, and, indeed, in a similar way of the means of obtaining the same. [110]

[1]This refers to *karmaphalabhūmi*, the word for activity and its result.

देशकालाद्यनियमात्पुमिच्छानामनन्तता ।
तथा तत्साधनानां च काम्येष्टार्थप्रयुक्ततः ॥१११॥

There is innumerableness of the desires of men owing to non-restriction in respect of the region and time (for them); so also, (it is there) in respect of their means, since they are employed towards the results suitable as the objects of desire. [111]

NKL paraphrases *kāmyeṣṭa* as *kāmayogyatvād iṣṭa*.

प्रतिप्राणि च वैचित्र्याद्देशकालादिहेतुतः ।

इच्छातत्साधनानां च स्यादानन्त्यं तथा सति ॥११२॥
पारिशेष्यनयो न स्यात्सर्वज्ञस्याप्यनन्ततः ।
न च कर्मफलत्वेन पारिशेष्यं प्रसिध्यति ॥११३॥
नित्यकर्मफलत्वेन मुक्तेरपि परिग्रहात् ।
न पारिशेष्यसंसिद्धिस्तथापीहोपपद्यते ॥११४॥

Further, owing to the variety caused by region and time etc.[1] (and) from person to person (*pratiprāṇi*), there would be innumerableness of the desires and the means of fulfilment of them. (And) that being so, [112]
there would not be (involved) the principle of residuum in the case of even the omniscient (person), owing to innumerableness[2] and there cannot thus be established the nature of the result of (the obligatory ritual) by the principle of residuum. [113]
Even by accepting liberation as the result of the obligatory ritual, its nature, as determined by the principle of residuum cannot be here[3] reasonable. [114]

[1]This refers to *icchā*.
[2]*anantataḥ* stands for *anantatvataḥ*.
[3]That is, in Vedānta.

नित्यकर्मफलत्वं चेन्मुक्तेरप्यभ्युपेयते ।
कर्मकार्यसजातित्वात्पारिशेष्यनयः कुतः ॥११५॥

If in the case of liberation also its nature as the result of obligatory ritual is accepted then owing to its being same kind of effect produced by activity how could there be the principle of residuum applicable? [115]

अर्थापत्तिक्षयोऽतः स्यादन्यथाप्युपपत्तितः ।
उत्पत्त्यादेरन्यतमो न च मोक्ष इहेष्यते ॥११६॥
उत्पत्त्यादिविरुद्धत्वान्मोक्षरूपस्य नित्यतः ।
नोत्पाद्यो वा विकार्यो वा विकारप्रतिषेधतः ॥११७॥

Therefore, there would be given up (lit. loss of the notion of) Arthāpatti, since there can be expectation (of the result of obligatory ritual) in some other way; (then) any one of production etc. cannot be here[3] accepted as liberation. [116] And, since its nature is ever opposed to production etc., therefore, it can never be produced, nor can it be modified, as there is rejection (of the notion of) modification. [117]

NKL edition begins verse 116 as *arthāpatteḥ kṣayo 'taḥ* ....

व्रीहिपात्रादिवन्नापि मोक्षः संस्कार्य इष्यते ।
असाधनत्वान्नाप्याप्यः प्रत्यङ्मात्रस्वभावतः ॥११८॥

Further, liberation is not accepted a thing to be purified like rice grains, utesils etc. So also, because it is not associated with any means, it is not what is to be obtained, since only such is the very nature of the inner self. [118]

नित्यस्य सर्वकर्मभ्यो वैलक्षण्याच्च कारणात् ।
कारणानुविधायित्वात्फलमप्यस्तु चेत्तथा ॥११९॥

(It can be argued:) 'Since there is reason for obligatory ritual to be different from all (other) rituals' the result of them, viz. to be in conformity with the cause, should also be likewise different.' [119]

नैवं कर्मत्वसारूप्यात्सालक्षण्यं भवेन्न किम् ।
काम्यकर्मफलैर्नित्यफलस्येत्यभिधीयताम् ॥१२०॥

'(This is the answer:) No, it is not so. Why should there not be similarity of the results (of obligatory ritual) with the result of other rituals proceeding from desire? Let this be told.' [120]

वैलक्षण्यं निमित्ताच्चेन्न नैमित्तिकतुल्यतः ।

क्षामवत्यादिवन्नित्यं कस्मान्न स्यात्सलक्षणम् ॥१२१॥

If the *prima facie* view will be 'dissimilarity (of the result) is on account of the cause'; the Siddhāntin's view is: 'No, (there could not be dissimilarity), since they are not on a par with what proceeds from some causes[1] exactly in the same way as the rituals called Kṣāmavatī;[2] why then should not the obligatory ritual have the same character as any other rituals? [121]

The idea of the *prima facie* view is: Other rituals proceed from desires on the part of sacrificers, while obligatory rituals do not proceed from them. This explains why they are dissimilar.

[1]The cause for an obligatory ritual is the statement in the Śruti *yāvajjīvam juhūyāt* which means that those rituals have to be performed as long as one is alive.

[2]This is a ritual prescribed for one whose house goes on fire on account of the ritual fire. SP refers in full the passage from *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. SP adds more examples of some rites which are performed for some reason. Therefore, it is understood, on the basis of them, that obligatory rituals are on a par with Kṣāmavatī etc.

न हि लौकिकचक्षुर्भिर्वैलक्षण्यात्समर्थ्यते ।
उलूकचक्षुषोऽरूपाद्रसादिग्रहणं क्वचित् ॥१२२॥

It also cannot justify (that obligatory rituals differing from other rituals must have the result, viz. liberation), because of its dissimilarity (with the means to it) in the same way as the eyes of an owl are different from the eyes of human beings; because, in the case of an owl's eyes, there is never noticed perception of taste etc. [122]

A very fastidious argument from the *prima facie* view: Just as an owl's eyes are different from a human's eyes, so obligatory rituals, though with the result, viz liberation, should be different.

This is answered by pointing out that the eyes of an owl cannot perform any function other than seeing. The argument is clarified by the following verse.

रसादिग्रहणे शक्तिर्लोके दृष्टा न चक्षुषः ।
सामर्थ्यस्याग्रहात्तस्मान्न विरुद्धा प्रकल्प्यते ॥१२३॥

In the world, there is never noticed the capacity of the eyes for experiencing taste, (therefore, that capacity to taste), though opposed (i.e. different), is never imagined (to be in an owl's eye), for (the simple reason that). [123]

सामर्थ्यं यस्य यत्रैव दृष्टं तत्रैव तस्य तत् ।
सुदूरमपि गत्वेह ह्यतिशीतिरपीष्यते ॥१२४॥

A capacity which is seen in respect of what must belong only to that; therefore, even if one goes so far as to cite the example of an owl's eyes. there is still here, in this respect, a certain excellence also.[1] [124]

This refers to men's eyes which are, in the act of perceiving, superior to the eyes of owls (*atiśīti*). The idea is that liberation cannot certainly be the result of obligatory rituals though they might produce some other results.

कर्मकार्यान्तरं नित्यं विषदध्यादिवद्ध्रुवम् ।
यदारभत इत्युक्तं तच्चाप्यस्तु स्वगोचरे ॥१२५॥

And, as to what is said, viz. obligatory rituals, indeed begin to produce some other effects of the activities, in the same way as poison, curd etc.;[1] let that be in respect of their own objects . [125]

This refers to verse 32 above.
[1]They are the four, viz. production etc.

यदेव विद्ययेत्यादि श्रुतेरपि वचस्तथा ॥१२६॥

In the same way is to be understood the statement from the Śruti, viz. *yad eve vidyayā.*[1] [126]

[1]Cf. CU 1.1.10: *yad eva vidyayā karoti śraddhayopaniṣadā tad eva vīryavattaram bhavati.*

देवयाजिसकाशाच्च विशेषश्चात्मयाजिनः ।
तदाहुरिति विस्पष्टं श्रूयते श्रुतिवाक्यतः ॥१२७॥

And it is clearly heard in a statement of the Śruti, which (begins) with the words *yad āhuḥ* that there is some (particular) distinction of one who offers a sacrifice to the Ātman from one who offers a sacrifice to (some) deity/deities. [127]

This is a reference to *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11.2.6.30. SP clarifies the meaning by the statement: *sarvakratuyājinām ātmayājī viśiṣyate.*

मनुनाप्यात्मयाजीति यदुक्तं परदर्शने ।
तत्रापि च समं पश्यन्नात्मयाजी भवत्ययम् ।
समदृष्टिप्रशंसैषा यदि वा भूतपूर्वतः ॥१२८॥

Manu also has said ***ātmayājī*** .... in respect of seeing the highest (Ātman); in that statement, there is a praise in the words *samam paśyann ātmayājī bhavaty ayam* of seeing all things as equal. And, this may be (a praise of the subsequent condition) to that, in which (the sacrificer) was earlier. [128]

SP refers to *Manusmṛti* 12.82, 83, 86 and 91 in support.

आत्मसंस्कृतये कर्म यः करोति यथाविधि ।
आत्मयाजीति मनुना स एवेहाभिधीयते ॥१२९॥

Here,[1] Manu has spoken of that person as *ātmayājī* who

performs the ritual activity according to the prescription for purifying himself. [129]

This has a basis in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* cited above. Also refer to the preceding verse.

[1]See the passage referring to it in the last verse mentioned in the note on the preceding verse, viz. 12.86.

सुसंस्कृतधियः पुंसो यथोक्तैः कर्मभिः समम् ।
इह वामुत्र वा ज्ञानं जायते मोक्षकृद्ध्रुवम् ॥१३०॥

In the case of a person, who has purified his intellect by the (performance of) rituals that are prescribed (for him) knowledge there immediately arises, whether in this world or in the yonder, which certainly leads to (his) liberation. [130]

Cf. *mahāyajñaiś ca yajñaiś ca brāhmīyaṃ kriyate tanuḥ* (*Manusmṛti* 1.28).

ब्रह्मा विश्वसृजोवाक्याद्देवसाष्टर्ग्यतिरेकतः ।
भूतापीतिं मनुः साक्षाद्दर्शयत्यविनश्वरीम् ॥१३१॥

(Also) in the sentence *brahmā viśvasṛjaḥ*, Manu has made (lit. makes) a clear (*sākṣāt*) mention of the eternal merger (of beings) into the basic elements over and above (their) assuming similarity with the deities (superintending over their organs). [131]

SP states as the basis of *brahmā* ... (*Manusmṛti* 12.50), viz. this verse from *Manusmṛti* 12.24, 26, 30, 41 and 51. Also he cites further *Manusmṛti* 12.88cd, 89, 90ab.

अत्येतीति तु ये पाठं कुर्वते तेऽविपश्चितः ।
यथोक्तदोषदुष्टत्वान्नात्ययो बोधतोऽन्यतः ॥१३२॥

Those who recite *atyeti*[1] as against this word *apyeti*[2] are

not intelligent, since there is not any other transgression (*atyaya*) than the knowledge (of the results of the rituals), owing to the fact that (that *atyaya*) is beset with faults which we have shown. [132]

[1]Sureśvara has earlier (in verse 131) mentioned *bhūtāpīti* on the basis of Manu's text before him (as related to the reading) *apyeti*. Now he controverts the reading *atyeti* (adopted by others) which signifies the result that is effected by ignorance.

स्पष्टार्थमुत्तरं भाष्यं न व्याख्यानमपेक्षते ।
यतोऽत उत्तरो ग्रन्थः सम्यग्व्याख्यायतेऽधुना ॥१३३॥

Since the subsequent commentary (by Śaṅkara)[1] is clear in meaning, it does not require any explanation by us. Therefore, now is explained the subsequent portion of the text.[2] [133]

[1]Refer to BUB (p.410 *line* 5 to p.414 *line* 4): *na cārthavādatvam adhyāyasya ... brāhmaṇam ārabhyate.*
[2]Read: *karmaphalasya saṃsārasya pradarśanāyaiva.*

Verses 134-142 are an exposition of the BU 3.3.1.

प्रयोज्यस्य हि बन्धस्य प्रयोजकमिहोदितम् ।
प्राधान्येनेह कर्मैव तदन्यत्तूपसर्जनम् ॥१३४॥

Here[1] was stated the cause of bondage for one on whom ritual is enjoined. And now[2] is principally[3] pointed out that ritual activity itself is the cause and (any) other (cause) is merely (*tu*) subsidiary. [134]

[1]This refers to the portion of the Ārtabhāga Brāhmaṇa.
[2]This refers to the Bhujyu Brāhmaṇa.
[3]This is to exclude time etc.

परिच्छिन्नापरिच्छिन्नं तच्च कर्म स्वभावतः ॥१३५॥

परिच्छिन्नस्य संव्याप्तिर्व्याख्याता पूर्वमेव तु ।
अपरिच्छिन्नसंव्याप्तिर्भुज्युप्रश्नेन भण्यते ॥१३६॥

And that ritual act is by nature limited and unlimited (both). [135]

To begin with (*tu*), the extent of what is limited has been already explained[1] and now, in the form of the question by Bhujyu,[2] is stated the extent of what is not limited. [136]

[1]This refers to the Udgītha Brāhmaṇa.
[2]Add: also in the form of the answer by Yājñavalkya.

ब्रह्माण्डाद्बहिरन्तश्च समष्टिव्यष्टिरूपिणः ।
व्याप्तिर्हिरण्यगर्भस्य बन्धज्ञानाय भण्यते ॥१३७॥

Now is told (for the full) knowledge about the bondage (caused by activity) the magnitude of Hiraṇyagarbha, who assumes outside the world and inside it, the forms, viz. (i) unified form and (ii) particular (*samaṣṭi-vyaṣṭi*). [137]

The purpose of this verse is to point out that there is not left out even a bit of Hiraṇyagarbha's magnitude. The kind of this magnitude is expected to effect aversion to ritual activity and aspiration for liberation.

वैषम्यप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं प्रश्नस्य त्रासजन्मने ।
प्रतिवादिधियो यत्नाद्भुज्युनाख्यायिकोच्यते ॥१३८॥

Now, a narrative is purposely (*yatnāt*) told by Bhujyu for (Yājñavalkya's) grasping the difficulty[1] of the question and also for affecting confusion[2] on his part. [138]

[1]SP paraphrases *vaiṣamya* as *alaukikārtha* 'non-worldly nature of the thing asked'.
[2]SP paraphrases *trāsa* as *vyāmoha* and further states that 'full confusion' is the means to win victory over the opponent in

a bet; *jalpa* and *trāsa* could be alternatively translated as trouble or fear.

लोकानामवसानानि पर्यपृच्छाम तं यदा ।
गन्धर्वं तत्र काले तमथाब्रूम क्व तेऽभवन् ॥१३९॥

Then 'at that time'[1] we had asked that Gandharva the limit of various regions; and then we asked (*abrūma*) 'where did they[2] go?' [139]

Here, in this verse, Sureśvara is very cryptic while summarizing the contents of the beginning of the narrative.

[1]SP states that 'at that time' is the meaning of the word 'then'.

[2]For the name of these, see *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 13.5.4.1-3.

अप्रसिद्धाभिधानोक्त्या वादिव्यामोहसिद्धये ।
अश्वमेधकृतो वक्ति भुज्युः पारिक्षिता इति ॥१४०॥

Bhujyu mentions the performers of the Aśvamedha sacrifice as the names (of Pārikṣitas), in order that there is confusion on the part of the opponents (*vādins*) by the utterance of a name not as well-known names. [140]

SP explains the name Pārikṣitas as derived from *parikṣit* 'that whereby is destroyed the sin all around, such as *brahmahatyā* ....

Cf. BUB for quotation: *bhrūṇahatyāśvamedhabhyāṃ na paraṃ puṇyapāpayoḥ* as a line for defining a sin; it is stated there as from some Smṛti (not traced).

पारिक्षिताः क्व तेऽभवन्नित्युक्तिस्त्रिरिहोदिता ।
त्रिरुक्तेरुपयोगोऽयं विभागेनोपवर्ण्यते ॥१४१॥

Where did they go, the Pārikṣitas? In this, there is first the statement of the name three times in the narrative, (therefore)

this mention of the name three times it is now (or, here *ayam*) explained, one after another (*vibhāgena*). [141]

प्रश्नार्था प्रथमोक्तिः स्यात्प्रत्युक्त्यर्था तथा परा ।
तृतीया याज्ञवल्क्यार्थं तिस्रोऽप्युक्तीरितीरयेत् ॥१४२॥

The first statement is for asking a question (to the Gandharva) and the second is (in relation to) the answer (by him) and the third (is a question) put to Yājñavalkya—thus should one say that there are three statements. [142]

Now, in verses 143-144, there is exposition on the meaning of BU 3.3.2. This begins with the description of the magnitude of the universe (bhuvana) and then discusses the question: 'Where were the Pārikṣitas?'

भानुस्यन्दनगत्याध्वा मितो यावानहर्निशम् ।
द्वात्रिंशद्गुणितस्तावान्व्याप्तो भानुगभस्तिभिः ॥१४३॥

Thirty-two times of (whatever be the extent of) the path covered (*mita*)[1] by the movement of the sun's chariot in a day and night is pervaded by rays of the sun.[2] [143]

[1]This is from verb root *mā* 'to measure'.

[2]SP states that this refers to the expanse of the earth that is covered by rays of the sun and the moon both. Perhaps this is suggested by *aharniśam*. This is based on a passage:

ravicandramasoryāvān mayukhair avabhāsyate /
sasamudrasaricchailā taratī pṛthivī smṛtā //

द्वात्रिंशद्भिरहोरात्रैर्यावन्तं देशमुद्व्रजन् ।
मन्डलीकुरुते भानुस्तावांल्लोकरवेरितः ।
शरीरमेतद्वैराजं देवताकरणं महत् ॥१४४॥

And that much region which is so described[1] (in popular speech) as the sun encircles by (continuously) moving for

thirty-two days and nights—this is the body[2] of Virāj; and that is great[3] body of the deity.[3] [144]

[1]*lokaraveritaḥ* is paraphrased by SP as *lokaśabdaḥ tenerita ukto viṣayīkṛta iti yāvat.*

[2]SP states that this refers to fire as based on the Śruti: *agnir mūrdhā.*

[3]This refers to the grossness of the one unified form mentioned earlier.

इयानेव तु देशोऽयं प्राणिनां भोगसिद्धिकृत् ।
अग्न्यादिदेवतानां च व्याप्तिरेतावती मता ॥१४५॥

Only this much is the region which brings fulfilment of the desires of beings (*bhogasiddhi*). So also, this much is understood to be the extent of the deities, Agni etc. (related to sense-organs)? [145]

This verse explains words *taṃ samantam* in BU 3.3.2.

लोकात्परं निरालोकः सर्वप्राणिविवर्जितः ।
पर्येति लोकं द्विस्तावत्पृथिवी पूर्वमानतः ॥१४६॥

Beyond (this) region, there is what is called Nirāloka, which is devoid of all beings.[1] And, as for (*tāvat*) the earth, it pervades double that region whose extent is stated earlier.[2] [146]

[1]This is to point out that it is not *bhogabhūmi* 'region for the enjoyment for beings'.

[2]This is the meaning of *tam samantam*. Yet the translation is doubtful!

लोकालोकगिरेर्भागः सर्वप्राणिविवर्जितः ।
समुद्रो द्विगुणो भूमेः परस्तादवतिष्ठते ॥१४७॥

That portion of Lokāloka mountain is devoid of all beings. Beyond the earth there exists an ocean[3] which has double the magnitude of the earth. [147]

यं घनोदमिति प्राहुः पुराणज्ञा विपश्चितः ।
ब्रह्माण्डसंपुटस्तस्मात्परेणाभ्येति सर्वतः ॥१४८॥

That region have the wise knowers of Purāṇas called Ghanoda. And beyond that, there exists all around the cover of the universe. [148]

SP states for this the Purāṇic authority, viz. verses from the *Vāyupurāṇa* 1.49.153; 1.50.82; *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* 1.19.160; 1.21.24.

पृथिव्यनन्तरं साक्षात्समुद्रः श्रूयते श्रुतौ ।
अण्डाद्बहिः पुराणे तु विरोधे स्मृतिबाधनम् ॥१४९॥

In the Śruti is directly heard that there is an ocean immediately after (i.e. around) the earth, but, in the Purāṇa, it is stated to be outside the universe. In such a conflict, there is (to be accepted) the stultification of the Smṛti.[1] [149]

SP clarifies this conflict by citing an illustration: there is a Smṛti text *audumbharī sarvā veṣṭayitavyā* and it is opposed by the Śruti text *audumbharīm spṛṣṭvodgāyet*. There is thus a conflict in this case. One might hold the Smṛti text as based on some Śruti which is to be inferred (as in the case of *aṣṭakā*). But this is of no help, since, when there is a direct statement from the Śruti opposed to some such inferred Śruti, the former prevails. See *virodhe tv anapekṣam syād ... asati hy anumānam* (*Jaimini Sūtra* 1.3.3.

[1]This refers to Purāṇa.

व्याख्येह संप्रवृत्तेयमश्वमेधकृतां पथः ।
स चैवं शक्यते वक्तुं लोकालोकादिमानतः ॥१५०॥

This is thus stated as the description (*vyākhyā*) of the path of the performers of the Aśvamedha sacrifice.[1] And it is pertinent here to state that in order to describe in relation to the magnitude of *loka* 'world' and *aloka* etc.[2] [150]

[1]There can be doubt as to why there has been given the magnitude of the universe. That is answered in second line.
[2]The word 'etc.' refers to earth.

यथोक्तपरिमाणेन ध्यानकर्मविवक्षया ।
लोकालोकादिकार्याणां परिमाणवचस्ततः ॥१५१॥

Therefore, there is a statement about the magnitude of *loka* and *aloka* etc., which are the effects of the rituals, with the intention to explain the nature of meditation on them as having the magnitudes (of each as) stated. [151]

अस्ति तावदयं लोको यथोक्तपरिमाणवान् ।
भानुप्रकाशसंव्याप्तो विराजो विस्तृतिस्त्वयम् ॥१५२॥

To begin with, there is, indeed, this world having the magnitude which is stated and is pervaded by light of the sun[1]—and this is the extent of Virāj. [152]

This explains *ayam ekaḥ* in 3.3.2.
[1]Cf. SP: *bhānuśabdaś candramaso 'pi bhavaty upalakṣaṇam.*

ततो लोकाद्विनिष्क्रम्य द्विगुणा पृथिवी स्थिता ।
समन्ताद्द्विगुणोऽब्धिश्च संवेष्ट्य पृथिवीं स्थितः ॥१५३॥

Having come out of the Loka, there exists the earth (which is) double in size. And all around the earth exists the ocean, having twice its dimension. [153]

This verse refers to *tam* ... in 3.3.2.

तं समुद्रं समुत्तीर्य यदन्यत्परतस्ततः ।
गन्तव्यमुपमानोक्तिः क्रियते तस्य सांप्रतम् ॥१५४॥

That other thing, which is beyond that, i.e. after crossing the ocean, is to be reached. And now there is presented a statement of a simile for it. [154]

This verse is introductory to *yāvatī kṣurasya* ... in 3.3.2.

कपालसंधिगं व्योम सामर्थ्यात्परिमाणतः ।
यावतीत्युपमोक्तेह श्रुत्याविष्क्रियतेऽनया ॥१५५॥
तेन पारिक्षितान्खेन चित्यात्मत्वमुपागतान् ।
अन्तः संस्थाप्य नयति समष्टिव्यष्टितामसुः ॥१५६॥

There exists the sky in the hole of the cover (of the world) as is determined by (its) magnitude. Here is the simile stated in the word *yāvatī* ... And hereby (i.e. through the hole ...)[1] is explained (the simile) by the Śruti. [155]
That the Ātman leads the Pārikṣitas, the Aśvamedha sacrificers, who have come to attain the status of the worship-deserving Ātman (i.e. Sūtra), namely those who, after having well-controlled them as either joined together or as several (attained the same). [156]

[1]Because the world described earlier has such a large magnitude, one could only posit the idea of a hole.

चित्यात्मात्र सुपर्णः स्यादादित्यात्माथवोच्यते ।
इमं देशं यतः प्राप्तानादित्याद्युक्तवर्त्मना ॥१५७॥

In this context, the worship-deserving Ātman is the eagle (*suparṇa*)[1] or perhaps it is of the nature of Āditya,[2] because (this one Ātman leads them) who have reached this place by the path beginning with sun (as) already described. [157]

This explains the meaning of *tān indraḥ* ... in 3.3.2.

[1]*suparṇa* can stand for Virāj or Sūtra.
[2]*suparṇa* may be a metaphorical description of the sun.

एवं पारिक्षितान्सर्वानग्निरिन्द्रो वियत्पथा ।
निर्गमय्याण्डतः प्रादाद्वायवे सूक्ष्मरूपिणे ॥१५८॥

Having thus led all those sacrificers of the Aśvamedha by the path in the sky,[1] Agni-Indra took them out and finally handed them over to Vāyu which has a subtle form.[2] [158]

[1]This refers to *kha* in verse verse 155 above.
[2]This is based on BU 3.7.2: *vāyur vai gautama tat sūtram.* Also Vāyu is known to have a more subtle form than Sūtra.

अश्वमेधमखापूर्वं देवताग्निरिहोच्यते ।
वायुवेष्टनमेतच्च यदपूर्वमिहोदितम् ॥१५९॥

Here, the deity is named Agni, as the *apūrva* produced (by the performance of) the Aśvamedha sacrifice; and this is covering (of the Pārikṣitas) by Vāyu which is mentioned here as *apūrva.* [159]

Cf. *apūrvam eva phalapradam, tad eva dharmāṇām prayojakam. vigrahavatyas tu devatā naiva santi. agnyādyabhāve 'pi apūrva-sattvād eve ...* (*Vṛtti* on *Mīmāṃsādarśana* by Kevalānanda 9.1.4)

वायुरेव ततोऽपूर्वमभिव्यक्ततनुर्मतः ।
अनन्तरमपूर्वस्य कार्यं निर्दिश्यतेऽधुना ॥१६०॥

Therefore Vāyu itself is considered to be possessed of a perceptible form. Now is mentioned later the effect of (i.e. produced by) *apūrva.* [160]

पारिक्षितानथादाय वायुः स्वात्मसमाश्रयान् ।
आपाद्य गमयामास तत्र प्राणैकरूपिणः ॥१६१॥

Later, Vāyu took with it the performers of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, who had resorted to it and brought them to the form of only Prāṇa as their (final end). [161]

अश्वमेधकृतो यत्र पूर्वे तस्थुरितो गताः ।
वाय्वात्मा गमयामास समष्टिव्यष्टितास्तये ॥१६२॥

Where the performers of the Aśvamedha sacrifice had earlier stayed, there did the Ātman, in the form of Vāyu, lead them so that they obtained the collective or particular forms. [162]

अश्वमेधमखापूर्वफलप्रकथनेन या ।
प्रवृत्ताख्यायिका सेयं समाप्तानवशेषतः ॥१६३॥

Thus here ends fully that narrative, which had begun with the statement of the result of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, in the statement of *apūrva*. [163]

प्रश्नशेषमथेदानीं स्वयमेव श्रुतिर्जगौ ।
यदि वा याज्ञवल्क्योक्तिरेवमेवेति यद्वचः ॥१६४॥
तस्मादित्यादिकं वाक्यं श्रुतेरिति च निर्दिशेत् ।
वायुमेव स गन्धर्वः प्रशशंसातिविस्मितः ॥१६५॥

Now, the Śruti itself has stated (lit. sung) the remaining part of the question. Or it could perhaps be, the words *evam eva* are the statement made by Yājñavalkya. [164]
One should point out that the statement beginning with the word *tu tasmāt* is made by the Śruti (itself). That Gandharva, who was greatly wonderstruck, praised only Vāyu. [165]

This explains the purpose of the later part of the Śruti: *evam* ... in 3.3.2.

वायुं मुक्त्वा बहिर्यस्मान्नान्यस्या विद्यतेऽबहिः ।
देवताया गतिस्तस्माद्वायुर्ज्यायानिहैकलः ॥१६६॥

Since Vāyu, being kept aside, there cannot be the existence (lit. movement) of any other deity, therefore, it is Vāyu alone who is superior (to others). [16

यत एवमतो ज्ञेयो वायुरेव न चापरः ।
व्यष्टिः समष्टिरित्येवमण्डादन्तर्बहिश्च सः ॥१६७॥

Since this is so, therefore, Vāyu alone has to be known and not any other, as particular or collective forms—thus he is both inside and outside the unverse. [16

These explain the meaning of *tasmāt* ... in 3.3.2.

व्याप्तिर्विशेषरूपेण व्यष्टिरित्यभिधीयते ।
सामान्येन समष्टिश्च वायुरेव द्विधा स्थितः ॥१६८।

The word *vyaṣṭi* is used in the sense of pervasion by some particular form and *samaṣṭi* in (the sense of) a general form; thus it is that Vāyu alone that remains (in this universe) in a twofold form. [168

This is the meaning of *vayur eva* in 3.3.2.

वस्तु यल्लक्ष्यते किंचिज्जगत्यस्मिंश्चराचरे ।
सामान्येन विशेषेण वायुरेव तदीक्ष्यते ॥१६९॥

Whatever thing is noticed in this world, which moves and which does not move, is understood only as Vāyu in a general and a particular form. [169

न सामान्यविशेषाभ्यां वायोरन्यस्य वस्तुनः ।
संबन्धो वायुरेवेति सावधारणवाक्यतः ॥१७०॥

(In this context) no other thing than Vāyu has any relation to the general and the particular forms, for (it is known from

the emphasising statement) *vāyur eva* 'Vāyu alone'. [170]

अन्ययोगव्यवच्छेदे प्रशंसेयमसोर्भवेत् ।
न त्वयोगव्यवच्छेद उत्कर्षस्तादृगिष्यते ॥१७१॥

In case there is another thing determined as related (to the general and the particular forms) then, that would be the praise of the inner self (i.e. Asu/Prāṇa), but that kind of excellence, resulting from such an improper relation, is not accepted (here). [171]

अश्वमेधक्रतोरेष समष्टिव्यष्टिलक्षणः ।
महिमाविष्कृतः श्रुत्या विद्यायुक्तस्य संभ्रमात् ॥१७२॥

This is (thus revealed) as the greatness of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, which is characterized as having a unified and a particular form, because they might posit a confusion on the part of one connected with knowledge. [172]

समष्टिव्यष्टिरूपं यो वायुमात्मेति संश्रितः ।
सोऽपहन्ति पुनर्मृत्युं मृत्युमात्मानमेत्यसौ ॥१७३॥

He, who has resorted to Vāyu as the Ātman, having unified and particular forms, averts (lit. destroys) death (which might come) again; he reaches his Death, viz. Ātman. [173]

इति श्रीबृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्यवार्तिके तृतीयाध्यायस्य
तृतीयं ब्राह्मणम् ॥३॥

****